MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—Then, why was the management vested in the hands of less experienced men in the past?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—You are concerned more with the present state of affairs than with the past. And having made the change, Government find that it has already resulted in some improvement.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—Did Messrs. Sirur & Co., themselves come forward to take up the management of the concern?

MR. S. SHAMANNA.—They were willing to take up the management.

Prohibition of Conferences arranged by the People's Federation.

MESSRS. T. MADIAH GOWDA and V. VENKATAPPA (Channapatna Taluk); R. DASAPPA (Devanhalli Taluk); A. M. VENKATASAMIAH (Closepet Municipality); VEERE GOWDA (Doddballapur Taluk); M. LINGE GOWDA (Kankanhalli Taluk); GURUSWAMI GOWDA (Hoskote Taluk); M. B. GURULINGIAH (Closepet Taluk); S. T. MALLASETTAPPA (Nelamangala Taluk) and M. S. PUTTARAMASETTI and H. GANGAPPA (Magadi Taluk).—

Q.—7. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) Whether it is true that the members of the "People's Federation" had decided to hold conferences in all parts of the State from 20th March to 20th April?

(*b*) Whether they are aware of the objects with which these conferences had been arranged to be held?

(*c*) Whether it is possible to state what those objects were?

(*d*) Whether it is a fact that the local officers prevented the holding of such conferences in some places; if so, what are the places in which the holding of such conferences was stopped and what are the reasons therefor?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN).—

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) and (*c*) Yes. The Government considered that the discussions at these conferences would mislead the raiyats and create trouble.

(*d*) (1) Nelapatna, Tumkur Taluk.
(2) Sugganahalli, Magadi Taluk, Bangalore District.
(3) Holera Kothanur, Kankanhalli Taluk, Bangalore District.
(4) Akkur, Channapatna Taluk, Bangalore District.
(5) Hunasanahalli, Channapatna Taluk, Bangalore District.

MR. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—Were not the objects of the conferences made known to the public through printed appeals and hand-bills?

MR K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—That might have been done.

MR. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—Were orders prohibiting the conferences passed after the notices explaining the objects of the conferences were issued?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Yes.

MR. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—From the notices issued, had the Government any reason to believe that the conferences were meant for creating trouble to Government?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Government did not rely entirely upon the notices. They made further enquiries in the matter and as a result of those enquiries felt that they should prohibit the conferences. The objects of the conferences might have been innocent, but the result might have been otherwise.

MR. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—What was the basis for the Government to suspect that the conferences would result in fomenting trouble?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—We cannot tell you all that.

MR. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—Are the Government aware that the local officers are not reporting facts to the Government correctly?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—That is too general a statement which cannot be accepted.

MR. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—Have the Government any idea of rescinding this order of prohibition?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—No.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—Are not the

conveners of the conferences law-abiding and respectable non-official gentlemen?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—It may be so.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—If the local officers had any doubt about the *bona fides* of these conferences, was it not their duty to send for the conveners and advise them in the matter?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Some of them were informed that it was not desirable to hold such meetings.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—When was the prohibitory order issued? Was it before advising the people not to hold such meetings or after?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—We first told them not to hold such meetings and then issued the order.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—Was there no assurance forthcoming from the persons responsible for arranging the conferences that they would do nothing which would create trouble?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—The officers were not satisfied with those assurances.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—Has not this action of Government tended to lower the prestige of the non-official leaders in the eyes of the general public?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—I do not think so. That was not the object of the Government.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—Was it for the same reasons that the conferences were stopped in all the places?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Yes.

MR. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR.—Were the meetings prohibited as a result of executive orders of Government or was it left to the discretion of judicial officers?

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN).—You need not distinguish between the responsibility of Government and the responsibility of the Magistracy in that respect. Government take full responsibility for the action taken.

MR. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR.—The prohibitory orders were issued under Section 39. If the orders were disobeyed, the conveners of the conferences would have made themselves open to punishment by courts of law. Was there anything to warrant a suspicion that the orders would be disobeyed? Have the persons responsible for convening such conferences ever disobeyed the section at any time in the past?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—These are questions which the member had better put to the persons concerned.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—Are the Government convinced that the intention of the conveners of these conferences was good?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Nobody has said that their intention was bad.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—What was the trouble which the Government apprehended from these conferences?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—It was feared that the conferences would create dissatisfaction among the people.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—Is not dissatisfaction already there?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—That is no reason why it should be increased.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—Was it not the object of these conferences to mitigate it?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—That might have been the object, but who knows whether the effect would not have been otherwise?

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—Were no such conferences held in the State in the past?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Some might have been held, but the circumstances also might have been different then.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—If at all the conferences had brought about evil results, would it have been difficult for the Government to handle the situation?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—Prevention is better than cure.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—Did any of the local officers report to Government that these conferences were calculated to foment trouble and should therefore be prohibited?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—You need not ask who gave the information. On the

basis of the information before them, Government thought that the conferences should not be permitted.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—Have the Government come to know that, as a result of the prohibitory orders, dissatisfaction has increased?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—No.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—Are the Government aware that similar conferences have been held in the Madras Presidency?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—No.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—Will the Government ascertain whether such conferences have led to any disturbances in Madras?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Government do not see the necessity for doing so, because, conditions in Madras might differ from those in Mysore.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—Do the Government know who are all the office-bearers and members of the Party known as "People's Federation"?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—No.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—Are they aware, at least, that all the members of the Federation are law-abiding subjects of the State?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Notice.

MR. BAGAMANE DEVA GOWDA.—Are the Government aware that a similar conference took place in Belur Taluk last year?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—The conditions of this year are not the same as those of last year.

MR. BAGAMANE DEVA GOWDA.—How did the officers of Government ascertain the objects of the conferences?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Government do not propose to disclose those details.

MR. H. K. MADIAH.—Do the Government agree that such conferences are desirable, or not?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—I am not in a position to give an opinion on that matter now.

MR. H. K. MADIAH.—Would it not have been desirable for the Government to allow some of the conferences to be held and then ascertain whether they were *bona fide* or not?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—That is exactly what the Government did. The nature of the conferences was ascertained with reference to the one held at *Mahimapura*.

MR. BORANNA GOWDA.—How were the objects of the conference at *Mahimapura* ascertained?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Notice.

MR. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Have not the Government assured the public that all grievances would be redressed if they were brought to notice; and was not the sole object of these conferences to bring the grievances to notice?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—The raiyats themselves can make representations to Government. We do not want third parties to meddle with them.

MR. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Are not the concerned leaders, members of this Assembly?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—It would not be in the best interests of the State for one particular political party to organise conferences like these all over the State. And, for having prohibited the conferences, as already stated, Government take the fullest responsibility.

MR. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Are not the Government aware that in most cases the raiyats are not able themselves to represent their grievances to Government?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—No.

MR. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Are the Government aware that the conveners of the conferences in question, being moderates, never intended to disobey the prohibitory orders, and that if particular individuals had been bold enough to disobey the order, they would have exposed themselves to grave risks as a result of this unnecessary prohibition?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—The member knows it best.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH.—Are the Government aware that the People's Federation is of a very recent origin and that its chief members who were organizing the conferences were more anxious to canvass votes in the rural parts than to serve the best interests of the raiyats?

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA.—Is it not a fact that there were no elections at the time these conferences were proposed to be held and that the conference programme had nothing to do with canvassing ?

At this stage, MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR brought to notice that the seating arrangements, though they were better than before, were not satisfactory and that members sitting in the rear rows could not hear or even see the President. He also brought to notice that the loud speaker was not working satisfactorily. He requested that better arrangements in both these respects be made in future.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—BILLS.

I. Statement of General Principles of the Bill further to Amend the Negotiable Instruments Regulation, 1917.

THE GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI) explained the general principles of the Bill as follows :—

"The object of the Bill is to amend the Negotiable Instruments Regulation, 1917, so as to provide that cheques originally drawn to bearer shall not lose their bearer character, notwithstanding any endorsement thereon whether in full or in blank and whether such endorsement purports to restrict or exclude further negotiation or not. The necessity for the amendment has risen out of the view taken that under Section 50 of the Negotiable Instruments Regulation, 1917, and the illustration thereto, a bearer bill can legally be changed to an order bill by endorsement. This makes it incumbent on banks to examine all endorsements upon bearer cheques, and this considerably increases their work and responsibility without any compensatory advantage to their constituents or to the general public.

"The law in British India has been similarly modified by Act XVII of 1934. It is necessary to amend the Mysore Regulation also since it is very desirable that the law in respect of Negotiable Instruments should be uniform in India.

"The Bill is intended to secure the above object.

"The Mysore Bank has also suggested that the amendment is desirable and necessary."

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO, in opposing the amendment, said that certain advantages existing at present were sought to be removed by the proposed amendment. For instance, a cheque, though drawn to bearer at first might by a series of endorsements later on be converted into an order cheque. But the amendment would result in doing away with that facility, because it sought to retain the bearer character. If by some inadvertence a cheque was lost and somebody not entitled to receive the benefit of the cheque were to pick it up, he could cash it by mere presentation at the bank concerned. The speaker did not know why either the drawer or the endorser should suffer merely because the cheque was lost. No doubt, a series of endorsements in each case might result in more work for the bank staff in the shape of scrutiny. To avoid that, some other simplified procedure might have to be adopted. But so far as the present amendment was concerned he was of opinion that, in view of the limited business experience in the country, the existing practice might continue.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN) replied that it was better to keep up the character of bearer cheques. If the argument against the amendment was that a bearer cheque, if it was stolen, would cause inconvenience or loss to anybody, the answer to such an argument was that the person should take as much care of it as he would in respect of a currency note.

MR. NARASINGA RAO replied that in respect of legal rights and characteristics, a cheque did not stand on all fours with a currency note. Further, if the main consideration underlying the proposed amendment was that bearer cheques should not lose their bearer character notwithstanding